

Motion for early termination
is denied 1/21/21.

s/John R. Adams
U.S. District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO



FILED

JAN - 8 2021

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
AKRON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

RONALD EVANS

5:19CR164-JRA

Case No. 02-CR-36-B-S

MOTION TO TERMINATE SUPERVISED RELEASE

AFTER COMPLETION OF ONE-YEAR OF SUPERVISION

PURSUANT TO TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1)

NOW COMES, Ronald Evans, appearing *Pro se*, and files this “Motion to Terminate Supervised Release”, pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1)**.

INTRODUCTION

The District Court enjoys “broad discretion” when after taking into account a variety of considerations, including the nature of the offense and the history of the offender, as well as any implications for public safety and deterrence,” it discharges a defendant’s supervised release. See *United States v. Jeanes*, 150 F. 3d 483, 484 (5th Cir. 1998). “These [factors] are largely the same considerations the court must assess when imposing the original sentence.” [I]Id.

Title 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1) states that: “ The court may, after considering the factors set forth in section (a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(4), (a)(5), and (a)(6), terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the person released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release...if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the person released and the interest of justice.”